

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-68 and 74-144 are pending in the application. Claims 69-73 and 145-149 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The claims are amended in order to more clearly define the invention, support for which is found in the figures and related parts of the specification. All of the independent claims are amended to require wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated. Support for the recitation of these limitations is found in original claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 12, 21, 77, 78, 80, 83, 86, 91, 95 as well as in the description as originally filed.

The specification is amended to more clearly describe the invention. Support for the change to paragraph 0067 is found in claims 32, 34, 62, 64, 106, 108, 138 and 140.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 11-12, 23, 32, 34, 49, 62, 78, 80, 81, 83, 85-86, 97, 106, 108, 115, 124, 138 and 140 stand rejected under 35 USC 112(1) as nonenabled based on the above-discussed objection to the specification as nonenabling. A patent application does not need to teach what is already known to those of skill in the art to which it pertains. Those of skill in the art of electrical engineering are already aware of how to connect sensors, logic circuits, relays and/or software. The operation of these subcomponents is very predictable. Therefore, utilizing a combination of sensors, logic circuits, relays and/or software to switch to a different radio mode in response to an alarm state or the absence of an expected signal is within the capability of those of skill in the art of electrical engineering. Similarly, utilizing a combination of sensors,

logic circuits, relays and/or software to switch between a plurality of power sources is within the capability of those of skill in the art of electrical engineering. With regard to claims 7, 23, 41, 49, 81, 97, 115 and 124 it is only required that one of the power sources recited in the claims be present, but it also within the capability of those of skill in the art of electrical engineering to switch between two or more of the enumerated power sources. These dependent claims clearly do not require that all of the enumerated power sources be present. With regard to claims 32, 34, 62, 64, 106, 108, 138 and 140 the specification is amended to describe these embodiments. As noted above, support for the change to paragraph 0067 is found in claims 32, 34, 62, 64, 106, 108, 138 and 140.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 69-73 and 145-149 were rejected under 35 USC 112(2) as indefinite. As noted above, claims 69-73 and 145-149 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-23, 26-27, 35-36, 38-49, 52-57, 65 and 68-73 were rejected under 35 USC as anticipated by Bandy et al (US 7,148,803).

Bandy does not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Brandin (US 6,566,997).

Bandy and/or Brandin do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 24-25, 28-29, 33, 50-51, 58-59 and 63 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Pulkkinen et al (US 6,954,148).

Bandy, Brandin and/or Pulkkinen do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 30, 32, 60 and 62 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Stlip (US 7,057,512).

Bandy and/or Stlip do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 31, 34, 61 and 64 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Stlip (US 7,057,512) further in view of Pulkkinen et al..

Bandy, Stlip and/or Pulkkinen do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 37 and 66 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Li et al (US 7,136,832).

Bandy and/or Li do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 74-77, 80-83, 85-97, 100-101, 109-110, 112-124, 127-133, 141 and 143-149 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Chuprun et al. (US 6,591,084).

Bandy and/or Chuprun do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode

that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 79 and 84 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Chuprun et al. (US 6,591,084) further in view of Bradin.

Bandy, Chuprun and/or Brandin do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 98-99, 102-103, 125-126, 134-135 and 139 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Chuprun et al. (US 6,591,084) further in view of Pulkkinen et al..

Bandy, Chuprun and/or Pulkkinen do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 104, 106, 136 and 138 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Chuprun et al. (US 6,591,084) further in view of Stlip.

Bandy, Chuprun and/or Stlip do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 105, 108, 137 and 140 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Chuprun et al. (US 6,591,084) further in view of Pulkkinen et al and yet further in view of Stlip.

Bandy, Chuprun, Pulkkinen and/or Stlip do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 111 and 142 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Bandy et al (US 7,148,803) in view of Chuprun et al. (US 6,591,084) further in view of Li et al..

Bandy, Chuprun and/or Li do not disclose or suggest the combination of wherein the radio frequency tag adjusts, with regard to the environmental state sensor data, a set point to lower power consumption, wherein the radio frequency tag can be switched to a transceiver mode that permits tag to tag communication and wherein the radio frequency tag is switched to the transceiver mode when an alarm state is activated.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include acquiescence to statements in the Office Action. In view of the above, all the claims are considered patentable and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned (at direct line 928-226-1073) for prompt action in the event any issues remain that prevent the allowance of any pending claims.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) pertaining to patent application processing fees, Applicant requests an extension of time from June 23, 2007 to September 23, 2007 in which to respond to the Office Action dated March 23, 2007. A notification of extension of time is filed herewith.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3204 of John Bruckner PC.

Respectfully submitted,

John Bruckner PC
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

John J. Bruckner
Reg. No. 35,816

Dated: Sept 21, '07

P.O. Box 490
Flagstaff, AZ 86002-0490
Tel. (928) 226-1073
Fax. (928) 266-0474